

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on October 30, 2003.
No claims are amended, canceled or added; as a result, claims 1-40 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-8, 12-14, 17-18, 22-25, 27-32, 36-38 and 40 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Itoh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,337,724). The rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Itoh et al. at a later date.

Claim 1 specifically recites: “a plurality of display devices, wherein each display device is subdivided into a plurality of sections, and each section is configured to display a sectional image”. The Examiner, indicates that partial images that are composed of color and luminance are two different sections for a display device. The color and luminance is for a single image, not sections of an image that are **tiled** as claimed. They are superimposed on each other as clearly seen in FIG. 2 of Itoh et al. The lenses 21 and 22 take the color and luminance and project them both onto a single section of the screen 1. Thus, not only are the color and luminance not sections as that term is commonly used, and as used and intended in the present application, **they are not merged to form a tiled image as claimed.** As seen in FIG. 2, they are not tiled as claimed, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 28 also claims a plurality of display devices, with each display device projection multiple sections of an image. Again, a display device in Itoh et al. does not project multiple sections of an image that are tiled as claimed, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 37, along with dependent claims 38-40 also distinguish from Itoh. Claim 37 recites “means for subdividing each display device into a plurality of sections; means for displaying a section image on each section of each display device; and means for projecting the sectional image displayed on each section of each display device onto the screen with the projected images merged into a tiled display.” As indicated above, Itoh does not divide an image from a display device into sections, but instead provides only one image per device that forms a section of an entire image. Thus, there is no means for subdividing each display device into a plurality of sections as claimed, nor can there be the means that merges the sections as claimed

since such sections for a display device do not exist in Itoh et al. Since each and every element of the claimed invention is not shown in the reference, a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. in view of Hirata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,299,313). Since these claims depend from an independent claim that has already been distinguished, and the new reference is not cited as providing elements missing from such independent claim, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 11, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al and Hirata et al. as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Sheridan (U.S. Patent No. 5,777,782). Since these claims depend from an independent claim that has already been distinguished, and the new reference is not cited as providing elements missing from such independent claim, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 19-21, 33-35 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. in view of Schwarzenberger (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,054). Since these claims depend from an independent claim that has already been distinguished, and the new reference is not cited as providing elements missing from such independent claim, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. in view of Zimmerman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,281). Since this claim depends from an independent claim that has already been distinguished, and the new reference is not cited as providing elements missing from such independent claim, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612) 373-6972 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.


Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW DUBIN ET AL.

By their Representatives,


SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 349-9581

Date Dec 29 '03

By 
John M. Dahl
Reg. No. 44,639

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 29 day of December, 2003.

Gina M. Uphus
Name


Signature